# Disclaimer by Dana (DanaDoodah RottingJewels) – In case she is talking about me: My Response

. The featured image is Dana's new "Disclaimer" decree. I would like to make clear that she does not and has not named me specifically but there is evidence in other posts of hers in and around that topic to suggest she may be including me in her directed decree. I have not posted anything […]

Whether she admits it or not, If it's the case that she IS talking about or including me in her "Disclaimer", I would then strongly opine that she is more doing that because she is upset that I will not abide or support some of the research directions or opinions that she tends to put in and around her documentations. And, going one step further, that that's the real reason she's barking about using spuriously unstable links. **She wants a chance to** "convince" or recruit people to what *I* refer to as her – **demons everywhere I'm on a mission from God** – agenda.

I am not in any way *not linking* to her X account posts to try and stop her from recruiting or whatever the hell she thinks she's doing. But she, however, I opine IS deliberately and with aforethought not crediting me because she doesn't want to **a:** lose people and **b:** is worried I might "recruit" them.

DONATE

INTERNET ARCHIVE
WayBackMachine

Sorry

We're currently facing some limitations when it comes to archiving this site. We apologize for any inconvenience this might cause and appreciate your understanding. Please email us at "info@archive.org" if you would like to discuss this more.
Return to Save Page Now

# A quick word on citing Twitter/"X" posts containing documents and why I don't recommend it.

. For some time now I have stopped citing with direct links to Twitter (now "X") postings that contain valuable documentation. I used to, but then Elon Musk rendered that completely unworkable as a decent, stable cite. You may have noticed that in a number of my postings this and last year, that I provide […]

0

mikemcclaughry.wordpress.com

completely unworkable as a decent, stable cite.

You may have noticed that in a number of my postings this and last year, that I provide a full size document image citing "Dana", usually with a date, most often for her "mindmap" documentation of various *The Process Church of the Final Judgement* aspects, but without a direct link to where I found them – in an "X" posting.

It isn't *just* her either, I would no longer do this with anyone at this point. She's just an example.

I was hoping to be able to resolve the problems with linking to "X" posts but I now strongly feel that it has become a dis-service to readers/researchers to put a link directly to an "X" post as a "source" because –

**1.** It's not stable and so far, can't be made stable by the usual methods.

Neither the archive.is or the Internet Archive will let you archive an "X" post properly to make a stable source, either.

Screenshots only can archive what was posted, they are NOT helpful in seeing the FULL SIZE document clearly for yourself, an important step for people to do. They are not helpful for that because of the obvious: screenshots are not interactive with the actual documentation – like Dana's mindmap image collages for example. They are too small when within an "X" post screenshot.

Then there's the fact that "X" posts can be deleted,

Comment Reblog Subscribe •••

mikemcclaughry.wordpress.com

Then there's the fact that "X" posts can be deleted, accounts shifted to "protected" status (in which case no one would see any linked to posts who isn't both an "X" member and a follower of the person) and other vagaries of life that aren't conducive to a stable interaction record.

**2.** It is utterly useless to provide a direct link for any readers or researchers who don't have "X" accounts and **don't want to be forced to get one**. They can't see the whole "thread" or sometimes even an individual posting even. It's like a crapshoot as to whether it might or might not work.

Totally unacceptable, in my book, as a true cite.

So far, the only work around I found recently is that you *can* stably archive an original "X" url that goes directly to the documentation image in question but that's it. Anything with "status" in the "X" url won't archive properly.

Maybe someday the Internet Archive will be able to start archiving "X" postings how they should be, but that day is not here yet.

Until then, I refuse to enable forcing readers and researchers into joining 'engagement' click-farming social media platforms as the only way they can fully see **publicly posted** documentation. That's a kind of specialized and covert gate-keeping I want nothing to do with.

Thank you for listening.

Virginia McClaughry

0




# A Correction Needed? Maybe…Maybe Not. I'll let the reader decide for now.

. Regarding my recent Dana Disclaimer post where I mentioned the OZ article that I tracked down and posted the first page of to a limited group of people elsewhere – Today, February 7, 2025 at 10:23 in this video, Dana presents an explanation of how she found out about the "OZ" article. She says: […]

0

Regarding my recent Dana Disclaimer post where I mentioned the OZ article that I tracked down and posted the first page of to a limited group of people elsewhere –

Today, February 7, 2025  at 10:23 in this video, Dana presents an explanation of how she found out about the "OZ" article. She says: "*one of the books is one that Echocat pointed me to and this is where we got that "Oz" article from that I showed you guys.*"

Well, ok.

The truth remains that is not how *I* found out about the article, it has nothing to do with her. The truth remains that I brought it out first and I'll add that one of the people who had access to that back in October – was Echocat.

Can it be proven that Echocat did NOT find out about it from me first back in October 2024? No.

The other thing is that Dana is still not being clean on giving a proper source for that article. Two weeks ago, she posted in her Strange Magick video (in the description section) this link … https://archivesonline.uow.edu.au/nodes/view/3495/…which makes it very hard for people to find it because she did **not** even give people the EXACT DATE of the issue.

I did. And I gave them the exact, **right to the issue**, link. See for yourself in my post.

Why didn't Dana do that?

It's almost as if she didn't find it herself or

truth remains that I brought it out first and I'll add that one of the people who had access to that back in October – was Echocat.

Can it be proven that Echocat did NOT find out about it from me first back in October 2024? No.

The other thing is that Dana is still not being clean on giving a proper source for that article. Two weeks ago, she posted in her Strange Magick video (in the description section) this link … https://archivesonline.uow.edu.au/nodes/view/3495/…which makes it very hard for people to find it because she did **not** even give people the EXACT DATE of the issue.

I did. And I gave them the exact, **right to the issue**, link. See for yourself in my post.

Why didn't Dana do that?

It's almost as if she didn't find it herself or something because…

If she had all those details, why would she be unsure of the date or give people a wrong date, and why she would not give people the exact link to the right issue?

Virginia McClaughry

Share this:

Facebook X

Reblog Like Be the first to like this.

web.archive.org/web/20250404073117/https://mikemcclaughry.wordpress.com/blog/
INTERNET ARCHIVE WayBackMachine
https://mikemcclaughry.wordpress.com/blog/
Go
27 captures
31 Jul 2019 - 4 Apr 2025
JAN APR MAY
2024 04 2025 2026
About this capture

2010 blog content by Dana regarding my first hand witness as a Sea Org member that there were controlled narrative women currently falsely claiming they were forced to have an abortion by Scientology, as well as 2023 proof that one of them, Claire Headley, was still attempting to portray that she had no choice.

0

to happen to you?

0

## What IS The Process? Answers #1 – L. Ron Hubbard and The Process Church of The Final Judgement

. This is a first, more limited or private premiere of a somewhat tongue-in-cheek (but not as tongue-in-cheek as you might think) video montage/cut up unique creation. It's something that's been on the back burner for some time now and today was the day it goes on the front

## Receipts: Dana, Emma of Imagination Podcast, Scott Gordon, Bernd Luebeck of Ron's Org (scientology) and and Nora Sova Ames of What's Up With Nora/Ohnomerica Youtube – Nuts & Bolts

This post documents one of our first emails to Dana, and begins to document some of the surrounding events and people mentioned to Dana such as Scott Gordon, Nora Sova Ames, Emma from Imagination podcast etc. as well as opening the door to larger questions concerning some of these individuals.

0